

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
December 9, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on December 9, 2002 in Sacramento.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Potential KOPs to be Included in the Oroville Relicensing Effort
Attachment 4	Proposed Representative Key Observation Points (KOPs) to be used for Impact Analysis

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting; several people participated in the meeting via teleconference. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The Work Group reviewed the desired outcomes of the meeting. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. No flip chart notes were taken.

### **Action Items – October 21, 2002 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the October 21, 2002 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #LU42:</b>	If available, provide summarized/updated version of project Gantt chart, showing project milestones for the next few months for the five Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics studies to the participants at the next Work Group meeting.
<b>Status:</b>	DWR feels the project Gantt chart is too detailed and dynamic that it would be of little value to the Work Group participants. A summary page was developed and distributed at the most recent Plenary Group meeting that lists interim/draft/final reports expected for December and January. It does not show the inter-relationship between reports or which reports are critical-path in the sense that information is needed for use in other studies. Jim Martin added that the Gantt chart dates differ from the dates included in the study plans to allow for DWR review time prior to distribution.
<b>Action Item #LU43:</b>	Send existing bike trail plans to Roger Calloway (DPR)
<b>Status:</b>	Mark Greenig confirmed that copies of all bicycle trail plans have been sent to DPR.
<b>Action Item #LU44:</b>	Distribute key observation point (KOP) photographs and preliminary analysis to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group prior to the next Work Group meeting.
<b>Status:</b>	This information was not distributed in advance of the Work Group meeting but is available for review as part of the study updates discussion later in this meeting. (See below).

## **Study Implementation Update**

Mark Greenig and other consultant staff provided status updates on the five Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics study plans. A brief summary of each study is presented below.

### ***SP-LU1 Land Use Study***

Steve Pavich with the consulting team provided a summary on SP-LU1 (Land Use). This study is organized into two main components: land use and land ownership. A preliminary land ownership map was presented to the Work Group for review during the meeting. Steve discussed the methodology (i.e., data sources, revisions to GIS data) that was used in the development of the land ownership map. He also spoke to the challenges associated with ascertaining land ownership in the project area. The main challenges include the quality of available GIS data and distinguishing between fee-title ownership vs. management interests on project lands.

Staff from DWR's Division of Land and Right-of-Way provided insight on the land ownership issue. It is DWR staff understanding that the State of California holds fee-title ownership to all State lands within the FERC boundary and DWR is considered the "maintaining" or "controlling" agency on these lands. DWR has effectively transferred management rights on substantial portions of project land to other State agencies (i.e., California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Department of Fish and Game) under a "transfer of control and possession", a legal document that basically gives the receiving agency an easement to carry out management and maintenance responsibilities. Federal interests which include Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) own the other public lands in the project area. No privately owned land exists within the FERC boundary. The consulting team will forward this description of the land ownership structure to DWR for confirmation.

There was a consensus among the Work Group that although the State holds fee-title ownership, it would be beneficial to map the controlling/maintaining and managing agencies on the land ownership map. This would document accountability on actions occurring on project lands and would also help FERC determine which agencies to address if project changes are requested.

The land use component of SP-LU1 is progressing but is also experiencing mapping challenges. The base data for the land ownership analysis is from DWR's land and water mapping program, which was last updated in 1994 for Butte County, and thus, may not represent current conditions. There are efforts to update this data based on more recent aerial photos and limited ground-truthing. The land use category titles used in DWR's base data are being modified so that the description better reflects the study purpose. Four major land use categories have been initially selected for the study: *Urban*, *Rural*, *Recreation*, and *Water*; various sub-categories have also been chosen under each major land use type.

The Work Group also discussed mapping standards; document and mapping standards are in the process of being developed for the project.

An interim report for SP-LU1 is being prepared. The interim report will be based on existing conditions and will be submitted at the approximate 80-85 percent complete level.

### ***SP-LU2 Land Management Study***

Mark Greenig with the consulting team provided updates on the remaining studies. SP-LU2 (Land Management) is progressing with staff in the process of acquiring and summarizing existing management plans. This study is inherently related to SP-LU1, and therefore, the work effort and information will be coordinated between the two studies for efficiency. This study is on schedule.

### ***SP-LU3 Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation***

SP-LU3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency) is also in the process of acquiring and summarizing all plans pertinent to the project. It is important that all of the Work Groups provide input on what plans should be included in this study. The participants discussed whether the other Work Groups could summarize their relevant plans to expedite the process and ensure proper characterization of each plan and agreed this would be very helpful.

The Work Group discussed the Oroville Wildlife Area (OWA) Management Plan. It was brought up that a 1990 Management Plan exists, but is not being implemented; instead, the OWA appears to be managed under a managing memo. Jim Martin, Resource Area Manager for DWR agreed to contact Andy Atkinson, the OWA Manager to discuss this issue. Meanwhile, consulting staff will obtain the 1990 document for review. Deliverables for SP-LU3 will likely be pushed back from January/February 2003 but this is not a critical path study so no other studies will be affected.

### ***SP-LU4 Aesthetic Impact Assessment***

Several new maps and handouts were distributed at the meeting. The handouts detailed potential and proposed key observation points (KOPs) (see Attachment 3 and 4, respectively). KOPs were also represented on a map for the Work Group to review during the meeting. Approximately 25 KOPs are proposed to be included in the detailed study analysis, with the remaining KOPs included in an appendix. Proposed KOPs listed in Attachment 4 include statements explaining why they should be included in the analysis. Mark Greenig explained that the number of KOPs proposed in this study is ample for purposes of the FERC relicensing process. The next step is for the Work Group to review the map/handouts and provide comments on which KOPs to include in the detailed analysis. One participant suggested that the KOPs be coordinated and reviewed by other work group RAMs. Jim Martin agreed to pursue this with other RAMs.

### ***SP-LU5 Fuel Load Management Evaluation***

The kickoff meeting for SP-LU5 (Fuel Load Management) is scheduled for December 10, 2002. Anticipated attendees include representatives from California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), U.S. Forest Service (USFS), California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), DWR, and consultant staff. Jim Martin reminded participants that SP-LU5 is a fuel load study, and will not result in a fuel load management plan.

### **Next Meeting and Next Steps**

The Work Group agreed that future meetings in 2003 would need to incorporate a review of study reports, which will necessitate providing reports to Work Group participants prior to scheduled meetings. Due to study plan schedules, the Work Group agreed to cancel the January 2003 meeting. The next Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting will be:

Date: Monday, February 24, 2003  
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM  
Location: TBA

### **Agreements Made**

1. The Work Group agreed to cancel the January 2003 work group meeting.

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

- Action Item #LU45:** Develop and forward the understanding of land ownership structure to DWR for confirmation.  
**Responsible:** Consulting Team  
**Due Date:** February 24, 2003
- Action Item #LU46:** Distribute interim report of SP-LU1 to Work Group approximately one week prior to the next Work Group meeting.  
**Responsible:** DWR/ Consulting Team  
**Due Date:** February 14, 2003
- Action Item #LU47:** Coordinate with Andy Atkinson (CDFG) on the status of the Oroville Wildlife Area Management Plan.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** February 24, 2003
- Action Item #LU48:** Obtain a copy of the Oroville Wildlife Area Management Plan (1990).  
**Responsible:** Consulting Team  
**Due Date:** February 24, 2003
- Action Item #LU49:** Provide new KOP map to Rob MacKenzie (Butte County).  
**Responsible:** Consultant team  
**Due Date:** As soon as practical
- Action Item #LU50:** Coordinate selection of KOPs to be evaluated in SP-LU4 with other Work Group resource area managers (RAMs).  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** February 24, 2003